

3^o : 7^{bris} 1647

10.

A T R E A T I S E

concerning the baptizing of
I N F A N T S :

Wherein is plainly shewn the necessity and
lawfulness of it, by the Word of God.

A worke so methodicall and concise, that the meanest ca-
pacity may in a short time be able to learne it,
and convince the Adversary.

Wherein, first Arguments are brought in, to proove In-
fants right to Baptisme. And then the Arguments
of the Anabaptists of any moment answered
and confuted.

By *William Harvey*, Master of Arts, and late Vicar
of *Odiham*, in Hampshire.

*There were false Prophets also among the people, even as
there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall
bring in damnable Heresies &c. 2 Pet. 2.1.*

*These be they who seperate themselves, sensuall, having not
the spirit. Jude 19.*



London, Printed for *John Jackson*. 1647.

THE EATSE

of the ...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...



To his Excellency Sir Tho. Fairfax.



IR, when the Egyptians had experience of that great famine, foretold to Ibraoh by a vision of seven leane ifavoured Kine, and seven thin eares of Corne, blasted with the East wind, &c. they addressed themselves unto their King, and crie out for bread; Goe to Joseph, saith Pharaoh, What he saith to you, doe, Gen. 41.55. May it please your Excellency, though (God be prayesed) we have no famine of bread, as our sinnes deserve, yet which is worse, we have a plerophoria of opinions, and some meere repugnant to the written word of God, very dangerous to mens soules, and threaten no lesse destruction to weake and unstable Christians now, then the famine did then to the Egyptians. Among the rude multitude, Anabaptists getting such footing almost every where, I thought it my duty, as becommeth the part of a faithfull Watch-man, to warne the people of England, That they dismember not their Infants of
A 2 their

their right to baptisme bequeathed them by sacred
Writ. I humbly present it to your Excellency, and de-
sire it may have shelter from the storme in the safe
port of your protection. Truth backt by Authority,
gets the more footing, and the Professors of it have a
fairer passage on the sea of this world: Thus cra-
ving pardon for my boldnesse, I rest,

Your Excellencies in Christ.

to be commanded,

William Harvey.



Ecause the Anabaptists, (whom *Musculus* calls the worst sort of people) doe oppose Pædobaptisme, that is, the baptizing of Children, and deny that wee have any ground in Scripture for it : It were worth our paines, and our oile were well spent, in proving out of God his word the affirmative part, to wit, That Infants, (though without actuall faith and repentance) must and ought to be baptized, and in confuting the invalid and weake reasons of the Anabaptists, brought in to maintain the negative part, to wit, That Infants, before they can give an account of their faith are incapable of this Sacrament, and ought in no hand to be baptized.

Argument. I.

And first, that Infants ought to be baptized, It is plaine, in that it is injoynd and commanded by our Saviour, *Matth. 28. 19.* Goe you therefore and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. And although children be not particularly named and expressed, yet they are not excluded but understood. For *universali mandato posito, pars ejus negari non debet*, A generall command once set down, a part of it must in no hand be denied. And whereas the Anabaptist gathers from hence, and the last Chapter of *S. Marke, v. 16* *robur erroris sui*, the strength of their error against Infants Baptisme, as if Christ tells his Apostles here who ought to be baptized, & who not, and that

baptisme extends not to children, because they must first be taught, and believe before they be baptized, of which things children are incapable, they are much deceived. For our Saviour in this of S. Matth. prescribes not to his Apostles whom they ought to baptize, & whom not, but only that they ought to baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Sonne, and of the Holy Ghost. Neither in that last chapter of Saint Marke, v. 16. doth he prescribe who should be baptized, and who not; but who shall be saved and who not. For teaching there and actuall faith reach only to the aduited, such as are of discretion, and doe not rob Infants of their baptisme.

Unde quod Anabaptistae volunt ex his duobus probare locis, prater mentem est Christi: That which the Anabaptist would prove from these two places, is beside the minde of Christ, sayth *Musculus* upon the place.

Argument. II.

A second argument S. Peter supplieth us with, Act. 2. 38. 39. Repent and be baptized every one of you, In the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of finnes, and yee shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are a far off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. Where the Apostle thus disputes:

Major. To whom the promise of Grace is made, they ought to be baptized for the remission of finnes, that they may receive the Holy Ghost.

Minor. But the promise is made to you & your Children

Conclus. Therefore you and your children ought to be baptized for the remission of finnes. that you may receive the Holy Ghost,

For

(3)

For mention is made there of children ~~and~~ without any difference of yeares, reaching unto very infants incapable of discretion. So that it is manifest, that children are no lesse meant and comprehended there by the Apostle, then when God sayd to Abraham, I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed.

Argument. III.

A third Argument, that the baptizing of Infants is lawfull, is this, Because it is the everlasting pleasure of God (without repenting) that the signe of the Covenant should not be denyed them that are within the Covenant. Now Infants are within the Covenant, and therefore the signe which is baptisme, must not be denyed them. And my Covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting Covenant, saith Cod, Gen. 17.v.13. where the word (Covenant) that is to say the signe of the Covenant, the Lord commands that all the Race and Posterity of Abraham, with whom he made a singular Covenant; should beare it in their flesh. And in the 14 v. he added this commination or threatning. And the uncircumcised man childe, whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soule shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my Covenant. The same is prooved in Matth. aforementioned cap. 23.v.19. where God commands that the signe of baptisme (which is water) should be conferred upon all, with in the Covenant.

But to be more plaine, that infants doe belong to the Covenant, and to the Church of God, is proved as well by the manner of the Covenant, Gen. 17.v.7. And I will establish my Covenant betweene me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting Covenant, to be a God unto thee, and (pray mark it)

to

(4)

to thy seed after thee ; As by this, in that Infants were no lesse circumcised , then they of riper yeeres. And it were absurde to thinke that by the comming of Christ, the Covenant is lessened , when in the old Testament it did extend unto Infants (*in novo solos spectet adultos*) It should now under the glorious Gospel reach it selfe unto men alone.

Besides all this, if Children are saved, viz. that come of faithfull Parents (as they deny not) how comes it they be not Members of the Church, for without the Church there is no salvation? For it is proper to the Church, that Christ loves it, and hath given himselfe for it, that he might sanctifie it, washing it with the laver of water in his word, as Saint Paul saith, Ephes. 5. 26.

The same doe the priviledges of the Church set downe in the Creed show. For wee believe first the whole Catholick Church, then the Communion of Saints, the remission of sinnes, the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting, meaning a glorious resurrection unto life. For the priviledges of the Church are there only recorded: Hence it is, that no mention of eternall death is there made because that the reprobates only are capable of it, and not God his elect. Now these foure priviledges of the Church agree with Infants, and therefore cannot be denied to be Members of it, and if so, then to have an interest in baptisme as well as the aduited.

Argument. IIII.

A fourth Argument is this, those who by carnall generation doe substract (as I may so say) and draw upon themselves originall sinne through Adams fall; and yet are not excluded from the Kingdome of Heaven, have a right to regeneration, even in this life; and therefore ought

ought not to be deprived of Baptisme, which is the signe and seale of Regeneration.

Now children that are borne of faithfull parents, come into the world with originall sinne, as no sound man will deny; and yet neverthelesse belong to the kingdome of heaven, and to Christ, as the Anabaptist himselfe denies not.

But none belong to Christ or heaven, neither can any come there, but such as are regenerate by the spirit of Christ, as Christ himselfe cleerely teacheth, Jo. 3. 5. Except a man be borne of water and of the spirit, hee cannot enter into the kingdome of God. And S. Paul Rom. 8. 9 Now if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his. Wherefore it is plaine, nay, *ipso sole clarius*, cleerer then the sun it selfe, that children are not to bee barred from the Sacrament of Baptisme, which lively represents unto our view Regeneration; and therefore Saint Paul gives it this Epithete, The washing of Regeneration, &c. Tit. 3. 5. But I proceed.

Argument. V.

Another argument is from our Saviours owne word and deed, as we have them in S. Matthewes Gospell c. 19. 13, 14. 15. where we read thus. Then there were brought unto him little children, that he should put his hands upon them, and pray, and the Disciples rebuked them. But Jesus sayd, Suffer little children, and forbid them not to come unto mee, for of such is the kingdome of heaven. And hee layd his hands on them and departed thence. And the same we have in the Gospel of S. Mark, c. 10. 14. and Luke 18. 16. where in both places wee have this added, Verily, I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the Kingdome of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein.

therein. From which severall places of Scripture we may thus argue by way of Sorites.

Those whom Christ commands to bee brought unto him, whom he takes in his armes, upon whom he layeth his hands and bleffeth, and to whom the kingdome of heaven belongeth, by our Saviours owne test, they are not to bee deprived Baptisme.

But Christ commands little children to be brought unto him, he takes them up in his armes, he layeth his hands upon them and bleffeth them, and sayth that to such belongeth the Kingdome of heaven. Therefore they are not to be deprived of baptisme.

But some will say, that these children were first received into Covenant by Circumcision. Be it so: yet it makes nothing against infants baptizing. For (as I sayde before) the Covenant is not lessened more now in the New Testament, then it was in the Old: and baptisme is as well due now to children, as circumcision was to children then. And it were very absurd to think the contrary.

Argument. VI.

Another argument the Apostle St. Paul affoord us, 1. Cor. 7. 14. where we read thus: For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband, else were your children unclean, but now they are holy.

Now if they be sayd to be holy, *ab ipso ortu*, from their very birth, and because they descend from faithfull parents who are in the Covenant, they likewise are within the Covenant, it is manifest that they have right to baptisme: and the reason is, the sign of the Covenant of right belongeth to such as are within the Covenant.

I will but adde one argument more, and so conclude, and that is this.

Argument. VII.

Baptisme is in the roome of Circumcision, which is prooved by S. Paul, Coloss. 2. 11. 12. In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sinnes of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ, buried with him in baptism, &c. Now amongst the Jewes, the men were not onely commanded to circumcise themselves, but their children also. This all that professed Religion observed. And therefore consequently, they that professe Christian Religion in these Gospel times, must have their children baptized, that they may be knowne to be a true Church, having the Word and Sacraments, and proclaime to the world, that the blood of Christ alone, cleanseth us from all sinnes; whereof water in baptism is a lively representation. And so come I to the Reasons and Objections which the Anabaptists bring to the contrary.

Objection. I.

And first, they object that it is no Apostolicall custome for Children to be baptized. And all that they can say is, *Non legitur*, wee have no Scripture for it, or any ground in the word of God to proove the lawfulnessse of it. Let us aske them this question: Where can they finde expressly, and by name, that women were admitted to the Eucharist, or the Lords Supper? And yet, what man did ever question the contrary? Now, as no man in his right wits, will deny that women were then admitted to that Sacrament as well as men: Why may they not believe that Infants were baptized, though it be not set downe in plaine words thus, Infants were baptized, or Infants must

be baptized : And yet the consequence of the legality of the one is as apparant as of the other.

But what say they to these Texts, Acts 16. 15. and 33. where wee read, that Lydia was baptized, and her household, and the Keeper baptized and all his. And againe; what will they say to that of the 1 of the Cor. 1. 16. The words of S. Paul are, and I baptized also the household of Stephanas : Had none of these severall families children? That is not probable : I hope they will not deny that Infants are part of a household, and if so, certainly they were also baptized by the Apostles. And if the commandment was universall, Goe and teach all Nations, baptizing in &c. Who doubteth but children were partakers of this Sacrament : But to this they answer, though the commandment be universall; yet it reacheth not to Infants, but to men and women of ripe yeeres, able to give a profession of their faith, and capable of teaching. And for this, they bring these Texts, Matth. 28. 19. Goe yee therefore and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and Marke 16. 16. He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved. Turne to my first Argument, and this is sufficiently answered : But to cut their combes, this maketh nothing for them. For if they be Logitians, they must distinguish, and put difference, *inter Ecclesiam constituendam, & constitutam*; that is, betweene a Church as yet not made, and a Church already made. In the one, the adulted must be taught, and afterwards if they doe believe they must be baptized first themselves, then their Children. But in the other Church, already settled, where men professe the Christian faith, and the Gospell of our Lord Jesus Christ, there I say, Infants must first be baptized, and

and afterwards taught, when they are capable of it.

And of this wee have a lively patterne and example drawne from circumcision it selfe. For when Abraham was commanded to circumcise every man childe in his family, Gen. 17. 10 No doubt but the men of his household (which were of discretion) were first instructed concerning this ceremony. But yet Isaack his Son, then an Infant was likewise circumcised upon the eight day, and yet by reason of his age, he could then give no account of his faith, or render any reason of the circumcision: For that was not expected till he should come to the age of a man. And if they can show no better card then this, they must needs lose the Set. For by the like reason wee may say, that the Infants of the Israelits were incapable of circumcision, being as lesse able to give an account of their faith, and as incapable of doctrine as our children are now. But this might satisfie a wise man; that babes now are baptized unto future faith and repentance, as the Jewes children were circumcised unto future faith and repentance.

Againe, they object, that unbelievers ought not to be baptized. True, they ought not, if they be adulated, and of yeeres of discretion, but children may: for one may be an unbeliever two wayes. First, negatively, that is to say, when the habit of saving faith is wanting. Secondly, positively, and that is, when one doeth not only want the habit of faith; but also is polluted with the contrary evill. Now negatively Infants are unbelievers, that is to say, as yet they have not actuall faith; neither can they have, in regard of their infancy, being incapable of it: But yet notwithstanding they are capable of the spirit of faith, by which in regard of the soule, they begin to be spirituall and supernaturall, and which is the beginning of spirituall operations,

operations, and in due time it is effectually, and this is in man, and remains in him, when there is a privation of actions. Without this spirit infants could not be united to Christ, neither could they be members of his mysticall body, neyther partakers of the priviledges of the Church, which are recorded in the Creed. Wherefore although children beleeve not actually, yet this ought no more to deprive them of baptism, then to deprive them of meat and sustenance, by that of S. Paul, 2. Thes. 3. 10. He that will not labour, let him not eat: for they cannot labour, therefore shall they not eat: And further, whereas they say baptism is given in remission of sinnes, and that infants have no need of it, because they have not sinned, they conclude not well. For although they sin not as Adam did, by act in their proper persons, yet they doe sin in him, or in his loynes, Rom. 5. 12. and 14. Wherefore as by one man sin entred into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned: and v. 14. Neverthelesse, death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adams transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come. And S. Paul 1. Cor. 15. 22. sayth, For as in Adam all die, &c. And therefore this foundation is too weake for them to build upon. For David playnely sayth of himselfe, Ps. 51. 5. Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me. And the Church of God we know, is by Christ, washed with the washing of water by the Word, Eph. 5. 26. Now infants of Christians are members of the Church, and consequently are likewise cleansed by the bloud of Christ, and therefore ought to have the signe of this cleansing, which is baptism; say the Anabaptists what they will, when they

(11)

when they will : And so I conclude ; with that of the Councell of *Carthagin. alias Milevit. Quicumq; parvulos recentes ab uteris matrum baptizandos negat, aut dicit in remissionem quidem peccatorum eos baptizari ; sed nihil ex Adam trahere originalis peccati ; quod regenerationis lavacro expiatur, anathema sit.* Whosoever doth deny that children even from the wombe of their mother, should not be baptized : or say, that indeede they are baptized in remission of sinnes, but yet are delfied with no originall sin from Adam, which is done away by the laver of regeneration, let him be accursed.

For all that hath beene said, yet let no man thinke, that if an Infant be prevented by death, and so dye without baptisme, it is therefore damned, God forbid, for not the want, but the contempt of baptisme condemnes. For children of faithfull Parents that depart without it by sudden death, are questionlesse saved. And severall Scriptures will proove it. First, *Exod. 20. 6.* the promise runs thus, in the 2 Commandement. And shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keepe my Commandements. *Sanè si in millesimam ; quomodo non in primam ?* Truly, if God saith he will shew mercy unto the thousand, how shall he not shew it to the first ? Againe, *Gen. 17. 7.* saith God thus to Abraham ; And I will establish my Covenant betweene me and thee, and thy seede after thee in their generations for an everlasting Covenant to be a God unto thee, and unto thy seede after thee. And Saint Peter, *Acts 2. 39.* saith, for the promise is to you, and to your children. And Saint Paul hath it thus, *Rom. 11. 16.* And if the roote be holy, so are the branches.

Yea,

Yea, if either of the Parents doe believe, their children are said to be holy though one of them be an unbeliever.

But some object that of our Saviour, John 3.5. Except a man be borne of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdome of God. As if children prevented by death of their Baptisme cannot be saved. But to answer this objection, the place there, borne of water, &c. ought to bee understood of the internall regeneration; for the water and spirit are put for the spirituall water.

And if a man take the meaning literally, as many ancient Expositors doe, for the externall element of water; yet as *Lombard* interprets the place, we must understand the words as meaning here of such, who when they may be baptized, yet slight and contemne it, and not of children wanting discretion.

Soli Deo gloria.

FINIS.
